UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,012	01/22/2002	Ariel Peled	02/23252	7791

7590 05/04/2006

Martin D. Moynihan
PRTSI, Inc.
P. O. Box 16446
Arlington, VA 22215

EXAMINER	
CERVONE, MICHAEL ANTHONY	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2131	

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/051,012	PELED ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael A. Cervone	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 March 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-179* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-179* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on March 20, 2006. The original application contained claims 1-179: Per the received amendment, claims 1, 3, 11, 15, 17, 21, 38, 59-61, 80, 108, 109, 113-116, 134, 152, 157, 162, 166, 174, and 176 have been amended. Presently pending claims are 1-179.

2. Notice of non-compliant amendment has been submitted because claim 62 has been amended to be dependent on claim 1. The amended claims received March 20, 2006 has the status of claim 16 as "original" where it should be "currently amended".

3. In response to amendments, claim objections and 112 rejections have been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed March 20, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons.

5. Regarding amended independent claim 108 and all claims dependent therefrom, Applicant argues that the prior art on record fails to teach the added limitation of the "trusted environment being operable to produce a rendered version of said digital

content and further being comprised of mechanisms to restrict tampering thereof". Examiner respectfully disagrees. A rendered version of digital data, as defined in the art, is data that is able to be properly displayed. Support for this can be found in the Applicant's own summary [See 0009] and detailed description of the invention [See 0218-220]. The prior art on record, Flavin, is directed to a watchdog for trusted electronic content distribution which receives a producer set which contains raw data, and transforms it into distribution content which is then distributed [See Col. 7, lines 13-35]. Examiner asserts that the transformation of raw content to distributable content meets the applicant's added limitation of producing a rendered version of digital content.

6. Regarding amended independent claim 1 and all claims dependent therefrom, Applicant argues that the prior art on record fails to teach the added limitations of "constructing at least two digital inputs, said digital inputs being operable in combination in order to produce a rendered version of said digital content" and "combining said inputs within said trusted environment in order to produce said rendered version of digital content, said trusted environment otherwise preventing access to said digital inputs". Examiner respectfully disagrees. As per the first limitation, combining the digital inputs in order to produce a rendered version, the prior art on record, Yeung, clearly shows in Fig. 9 and Col. 9, lines 24-50 that the key must be applied (combined) with the content in order to produce displayable unencrypted (rendered) content. As per the second limitation, producing the rendered content within the trusted environment,

examiner points to the argument regarding claim 108 above, as well as the reasons for combination of the Yeung and Flavin references as stated in the original office action.

7. Examiner maintains that the prior art on record teach the added limitation of claims 1 and 108, for reasons as stated above. Accordingly, the rejection for the pending claims 1-179 is respectfully maintained as given below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 108-134, 152-161, 163-165 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Flavin et al: (US Patent Number 6,219,788).

10. As per claim 108, Flavin is directed to a method for secure distribution of digital content comprising the steps of:

a. Transferring digital media content to an untrusted environment (distributors/subscribers computer). See Col. 4 lines 16-18.

b. Using a trusted environment (watchdog) within said untrusted environment (distributors/subscribers computer), said trusted environment being operable to produce a rendered version of said digital content, and further being comprised of mechanisms to restrict tampering thereof (Tamper Protection). See Col. 3 lines 36-41 and Col. 4 lines 8-15 as well as Col. 7, line 13-35.

11. As per claim 109, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 108. Furthermore, Flavin teaches the trusted environment (watchdog) comprises of at least two components. See Col. 4 lines 32-36.

12. As per claim 110, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 109. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the components comprise of at least one hardware component. See Col. 3 lines 36-41. [Although Flavin is specifically referring to the watchdog itself, it is obvious that if the watchdog is a hardware component, then there exists at least one hardware component. Therefore the examiner asserts that Flavin does teach the components comprise at least one hardware component].

13. As per claim 111, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 109. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the components comprise of at least one software component. See Col. 3 lines 36-41. [Although Flavin is specifically referring to the watchdog itself, it is obvious that if the watchdog is a software component, then there

exists at least one software component. Therefore the examiner asserts that Flavin does teach the components comprise at least one software component].

14. As per claim 112, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 109. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the components comprise of at least one firmware component. See Col. 3 lines 36-41. [Although Flavin is specifically referring to the watchdog itself, it is obvious that if the watchdog is a firmware component, then there exists at least one firmware component. Therefore the examiner asserts that Flavin does teach the components comprise at least one firmware component].

15. As per claim 113, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 108. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the trusted environment is a hardware component. See Col. 3 lines 36-41.

16. As per claim 114, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 108. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the trusted environment is a firmware component. See Col. 3 lines 36-41.

17. As per claim 115, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 108. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the trusted environment is a software component. See Col. 3 lines 36-41.

18. As per claim 116, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 109. Furthermore Flavin teaches that the components comprise a watchdog component, wherein the watchdog component is capable of monitoring other components of the trusted environment. See Col. 4 lines 29-43.

19. As per claim 117, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 116. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the monitoring comprises of authentication. See Col. 4 lines 32-43 and Col. 3 lines 59-65.

20. As per claim 118, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 117. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the authentication comprises authentication of a certificate. See Col. 5 lines 28-31.

21. As per claim 119, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 118. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the certificate is a cryptographic certificate. See Col. 5 lines 28-31.

22. As per claim 120, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 117. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the authentication comprises of the authentication of the code of the component. See Col. 5 lines 25-28.

23. As per claim 121, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 120. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the authentication of the code of the component comprises calculating a derivative of the code. See Col. 5 lines 25-28.

24. As per claim 122, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 120. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the authentication of the code of the component comprises calculating an analysis of the potential operation of the code. See Col. 5 lines 25-28.

25. As per claim 123, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 117. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the authentication comprises of a challenge-response method which comprises of a step in which the watchdog component queries the authenticated component issuing an input and further comprises of a later step in which the authenticated component issues an output to the watchdog, the output dependent on the input and the authentication is based on the correctness of the output depending on the input. See Col. 5 lines 16-37.

26. As per claim 124, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 116. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the monitoring comprises monitoring of the operation of the components. See Abstract and Col. 3 lines 36-41.

27. As per claim 125, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 124. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the monitoring of the operation of the components comprises monitoring of the used interfaces (processing engine). See Col. 5 lines 28-33.

28. As per claim 126, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 125. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the monitoring of used interfaces comprises monitoring of used operating system calls. See Col. 3 lines 56-57 and Col. 5 lines 28-33.

29. As per claim 127, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 125. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the monitoring of used interfaces comprises monitoring of file (records) operations. See Col. 4 lines 36-42 and Col. 5 lines 28-33.

30. As per claim 128, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 125. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the monitoring of used interfaces comprises monitoring of memory operations. See Col. 3 lines 56-57 and Col. 5 lines 28-33.

31. As per claim 129, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 125. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the monitoring of used interfaces comprises monitoring of communication operations (log). See Col. 5 lines 6-15 and 28-33.

32. As per claim 130, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 125. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the monitoring of used interfaces comprises monitoring of driver operations. See Col. 3 lines 56-57 and Col. 5 lines 28-33.

33. As per claim 131, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 125. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the monitoring of used interfaces comprises monitoring of input operations.

34. As per claim 132, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 125. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the monitoring of used interfaces comprises monitoring of output operations. See Col. 3 lines 56-57 and Col. 5 lines 28-33.

35. As per claim 133, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 125. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the monitoring of used interfaces comprises monitoring of interfaces used by interfaced entities. See Col. 5 lines 28-33.

36. As per claim 134, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 108. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the trusted environment comprises at least one updateable component. See Col. 5 lines 33-37.

37. As per claims 152-155 and 157-160, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 109. See arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 116-119. Claims 152-

155 and 157-160 are rejected based on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 116-119, respectively.

38. As per claim 156, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 153. See arguments with respect to the rejection of claim 123. Claim 156 is rejected based on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 123.

39. As per claim 161, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 158. See arguments with respect to the rejection of claim 123. Claim 161 is rejected based on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 123.

40. As per claim 163, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 116. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the information gathered from monitoring by at least one component is transferred to the watchdog component by said component. See Col. 5 lines 16-36 and Fig. 4.

41. As per claim 164, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 163. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the information gathered by the watchdog component is transferred as credentials information to a credentials based decision making mechanism (Authenticated Execution Unit). See Col. 5 lines 16-36 and Fig. 4.

42. As per claim 165, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 116. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the information gathered by the watchdog component is transferred as credentials information to a credentials based decision making mechanism (Authenticated Execution Unit). See Col. 5 lines 16-36 and Fig. 4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

43. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

44. Claims 1-41 and 59-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeung et al. (US Patent Number 6,668,246) in view of Flavin et al. (US Patent Number 6,219,788).

45. As per claim 1, Yeung is directed towards a method for secure distribution of digital content to an untrusted environment comprising the steps of:

a. Constructing at least two digital inputs (key 1 or 2 and content 900), said inputs being operable in combination in order to produce a rendered version of said digital content. See Figure 9 and Col. 9, lines 24-50.

b. Transferring digital media to an environment (Client Platform 120) such that each of the inputs (key 1 or 2 and content 900) is transmitted via a different

path and combining said inputs in order to reproduce said digital content. See Figure 9 and Col. 9, lines 24-50.

Yeung fails to disclose constructing a trusted environment within untrusted environment and combining the inputs within the trusted environment to produce the rendered version. Flavin discloses a watchdog for trusted electronic content distribution that constructs a trusted environment (watch puppy) within an untrusted environment (subscriber site) and produces a rendered version of digital content. See Col. 8 lines 45-50 as well as Col. 7, lines 13-35.

Yeung and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Yeung to include the computer watchdog system of Flavin. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content by providing the distributor with a trustworthy measurement of the content distributed in order to prevent unauthorized use of the content (Col. 2 lines 38-64).

46. As per claim 2, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Furthermore, Yeung teaches that the digital content is a document (text). See Col. 2 lines 60-63.

47. As per claim 3, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Furthermore, Yeung teaches that the digital content is multimedia digital content. See Col. 2 lines 60-63.

48. As per claim 4, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 3. Furthermore, Yeung teaches that the multimedia digital content is an audio digital content. See Col. 2 lines 60-63.

49. As per claim 5, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 3. Furthermore, Yeung teaches that the multimedia digital content is a video digital content. See Col. 2 lines 60-63.

50. As per claim 6, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 3. Furthermore, Yeung teaches that the multimedia digital content consists of at least two different streams. See Col. 2 lines 60-63.

51. As per claim 7, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 6. Furthermore, Yeung teaches that at least one of the different streams consists of video digital content. See Col. 2 lines 60-63.

52. As per claim 8, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 6. Furthermore, Yeung teaches that at least one of the different streams consists of audio digital content. See Col. 2 lines 60-63.

53. As per claim 9, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 6. Furthermore, Yeung teaches that at least one of the different streams consists of textual digital content. See Col. 2 lines 60-63.

54. As per claim 10, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Furthermore, Yeung teaches that the untrusted environment comprises a consumer's (client) computer. See Fig 9 item 120.

55. As per claim 11, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Yeung does not specifically refer to a trusted environment comprising of a software component, however Flavin teaches a trusted environment (watchdog) comprising of a software component. See Col. 3 lines 36-41. Yeung and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Yeung to include the computer watchdog system of Flavin. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content by providing the distributor with a trustworthy measurement of the content distributed in order to prevent unauthorized use of the content (Col. 2 lines 38-64).

56. As per claim 12, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 11. Yeung does not specifically refer to an updateable software component, however Flavin teaches that the software component is updateable. See Col. 5 lines 33-37. Yeung and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Yeung to include the computer watchdog system of Flavin. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content by providing the distributor with a trustworthy measurement of the content distributed in order to prevent unauthorized use of the content (Col. 2 lines 38-64).

57. As per claim 13, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 11. Yeung does not specifically refer to a tamper resistant software component, however Flavin teaches that the software component comprises of at least one tamper resistant software component. See Col. 5 lines 37-60. Yeung and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Yeung to include the computer watchdog system of Flavin. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content by providing the distributor with a trustworthy measurement of the content distributed in order to prevent unauthorized use of the content (Col. 2 lines 38-64).

58. As per claim 14, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 13. Yeung does not specifically refer to an updatable software component, however Flavin teaches that at least one of the software components is updateable. See Col. 5 lines 33-37. Yeung and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Yeung to include the computer watchdog system of Flavin. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content by providing the distributor with a trustworthy measurement of the content distributed in order to prevent unauthorized use of the content (Col. 2 lines 38-64).

59. As per claim 15, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Yeung does not specifically refer to a trusted environment comprising of a hardware component, however Flavin teaches that the trusted environment (watchdog) comprises of a hardware component. See Col. 3 lines 36-41. Yeung and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Yeung to include the computer watchdog system of Flavin. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content by providing the distributor with a trustworthy measurement of the content distributed in order to prevent unauthorized use of the content (Col. 2 lines 38-64).

60. As per claim 16, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 15. Yeung does not specifically refer to a tamper resistant hardware component, however Flavin teaches that the hardware component comprises of at least one tamper resistant hardware component. See Col. 5 lines 37-60. Yeung and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Yeung to include the computer watchdog system of Flavin. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content by providing the distributor with a trustworthy measurement of the content distributed in order to prevent unauthorized use of the content (Col. 2 lines 38-64).

61. As per claim 17, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Yeung does not specifically refer to a trusted environment comprising of a firmware component, however Flavin teaches that the trusted environment (watchdog) comprises of a firmware component. See Col. 3 lines 36-41. Yeung and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Yeung to include the computer watchdog system of Flavin. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content by providing the distributor with a trustworthy measurement of the content distributed in order to prevent unauthorized use of the content (Col. 2 lines 38-64).

62. As per claim 18, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 17. Yeung does not specifically refer to an updateable firmware component, however Flavin teaches that the firmware component is updateable. See Col. 5 lines 33-37. Yeung and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Yeung to include the computer watchdog system of Flavin. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content by providing the distributor with a trustworthy measurement of the content distributed in order to prevent unauthorized use of the content (Col. 2 lines 38-64).

63. As per claim 19, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 17. Yeung does not specifically refer to a tamper resistant firmware component, however Flavin teaches that the firmware component comprises of at least one tamper resistant firmware component. See Col. 5 lines 37-60. Yeung and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Yeung to include the computer watchdog system of Flavin. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content by providing the distributor with a trustworthy measurement of the content distributed in order to prevent unauthorized use of the content (Col. 2 lines 38-64).

64. As per claim 20, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 19. Yeung does not specifically refer to an updatable tamper resistant firmware component, however Flavin teaches that at least one of the tamper resistant firmware components are updateable. See Col. 5 lines 33-37. Yeung and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Yeung to include the computer watchdog system of Flavin. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content by providing the distributor with a trustworthy measurement of the content distributed in order to prevent unauthorized use of the content (Col. 2 lines 38-64).

65. As per claim 21, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Yeung does not specifically refer to a trusted environment comprising of at least two components, however Flavin teaches that the trusted environment comprises at least two components. See Col. 3 lines 36-41. Yeung and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Yeung to include the computer watchdog system of Flavin. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content by providing the distributor with a trustworthy measurement of the content distributed in order to prevent unauthorized use of the content (Col. 2 lines 38-64).

66. As per claims 22-31, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 21. See arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 11-20. Claims 22-31 are rejected based on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 11-20, respectively.

67. As per claim 32, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Furthermore, Yeung discloses a method wherein one of the inputs comprises of a key. See Fig. 9.

68. As per claim 33, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 32. Furthermore, Yeung discloses a method wherein the key is a cryptographic key. See Col. 3, lines 15-28.

69. As per claim 34, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 32. Furthermore, Yeung discloses a method wherein the key is a scrambling key. See Col. 6, lines 32-36.

70. As per claim 35, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Furthermore, Yeung discloses at least one of the inputs comprises of a scrambled copy of digital content (content 900) and at least one other input comprises of the information needed for said reproduction (key 1 and 2). See Figure 9.

71. As per claim 36, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Furthermore, Yeung disclose a group of at least two inputs comprising a function of a scrambled copy of said digital content and at least one other input comprising of the information needed for reconstruction (Key). See Col. 7 lines 37-41.

72. As per claim 37, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Furthermore, Yeung teaches the reproduction results in an output which is identical to the said digital content. Col. 8 lines 10-12.

73. As per claim 38, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Furthermore, Yeung teaches the reproduction results in an output which is similar to the said digital content. Col. 8 lines 6-10.

74. As per claim 39, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Furthermore, Yeung disclose a group of at least two inputs comprising a function of a digital content. See Col. 7 lines 37-41.

75. As per claim 40, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 39. Furthermore, Yeung disclose a function comprising splitting the digital content into inputs. See Col. 7 lines 37-41.

76. As per claim 41, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Yeung does not specifically refer to an updateable component, however Flavin teaches that software updates are available. See Col. 5 lines 33-37. Therefore, the examiner asserts that Flavin teaches an updateable component. Yeung and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Yeung to include the computer watchdog system of Flavin. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content by providing the distributor with a trustworthy measurement of the content distributed in order to prevent unauthorized use of the content (Col. 2 lines 38-64).

77. As per claim 59, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Furthermore, Yeung teaches that the digital content is split into separate inputs (Data [prior to scrambling] and Keys) in a trusted server (Server Platform 110), server is operable to deliver said digital content to said trusted environment in the form of separate inputs (Data and Keys). See Fig. 9 and Col. 9 lines 23-50.

78. As per claim 60, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 59. Furthermore, Yeung teaches that the digital content arrives in the form of second separate inputs (Data Content 900 and Keys) different from the first separate inputs to the trusted server (Server Platform 110), the trusted server is operable to rearrange said

content to the form of first separate inputs (Descrambled Data and Keys). See Fig. 9 and Col. 9 lines 23-50.

79. As per claim 61, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1. Furthermore, Yeung teaches that the digital content arrives in the form of separate inputs (Data and Keys) to a server (Server Platform 110), the server is operable to deliver the digital content to the trusted environment in the form of separate inputs (Data and Keys). See Fig. 9 and Col. 9 lines 23-50.

80. As per claim 62, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 1, Flavin further teaches:

a. Gathering input from at least one source (content archive). See Col. 7 lines 51-52.

b. Producing trustworthiness credentials about the digital content's intended recipient environment based on the input. See Col. 7 lines 52-55.

c. Evaluate the intended recipient environments trustworthiness credentials. See Col. 7 lines 25-27.

d. Determine a distribution policy according to the trustworthiness credentials evaluation. See Col. 7 lines 36-38.

e. Performing decisions about the distribution according to the policy. See Col. 7 lines 56-57.

81. As per claim 63, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 62. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the digital content is a document (world wide web pages). See Col. 1 lines 15-20.

82. As per claim 64, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 62. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the digital content is multimedia digital content. See Col. 1 lines 15-20.

83. As per claim 65, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 64. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the digital content is an audio digital content (music). See Col. 1 lines 15-20.

84. As per claim 66, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 64. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the digital content is a video digital content (movies). See Col. 1 lines 15-20.

85. As per claim 67, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 64. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the digital content consists of at least two different streams (digital video). See Col. 1 lines 15-20.

86. As per claim 68, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 62. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the credentials comprise geo-location information (pre-specified area). See Col. 7 lines 25-35.

87. As per claim 69, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 62. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the credentials comprise geo-location (pre-specified area) authentication level (Subscribers selection programs) information. See Col. 7 lines 25- 35 and lines 48-67.

88. As per claim 70, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 62. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the credentials comprise authentication level (Subscribers selection programs) information. See Col. 7 lines 48-67.

89. As per claim 71, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 62. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the credentials comprise information gathered in the past (content archive). See Col. 7 lines 36-41.

90. As per claim 72, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 71. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the credentials comprise information gathered from the analysis of information gathered in the past (content archive). See Col. 7 lines 36-45.

91. As per claim 73, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 71. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the information gathered in the past comprises of usage information (customized advertisements). See Col. 8 lines 4-13.

92. As per claim 74, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 62. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the credentials comprise of information about the environment into which the digital content is to be distributed. See Col. 7 line 25 - Col. 8 line 12.

93. As per claim 75, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 74. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the information about the environment into which the digital content is to be distributed comprises of information about the software environment into which the digital content is to be distributed. See Col. 7 line 25 - Col. 8 line 12.

94. As per claim 76, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 74. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the information about the environment into which the digital content is to be distributed comprises of information about the hardware environment into which the digital content is to be distributed. See Col. 7 line 25 - Col. 8 line 12.

95. As per claim 77, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 76. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the information about the hardware environment into which the digital content is to be distributed comprises of information about the video output hardware in the environment. See Col. 7 line 25 - Col. 8 line 12.

96. As per claim 78, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 76. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the information about the hardware environment into which the digital content is to be distributed comprises of information about the sound output hardware in the environment. See Col. 7 line 25 - Col. 8 line 12.

97. As per claim 79, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 74. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the information about the environment into which the digital content is to be distributed comprises of information about the firmware environment into which the digital content is to be distributed. See Col. 7 line 25 - Col. 8 line 12.

98. As per claim 80, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 62. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the credentials comprise of reports from at least one trusted component (distribution log of watchdog). See Col. 4 lines 36-42.

99. As per claim 81, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 80. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that at least one of the components reside in the consumer's (subscriber's) computer. See Col. 4 lines 31- 42 and Col. 8 lines 63-65.

100. As per claim 82, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 80. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that at least one of components is connected to the consumer's (subscriber's) computer. See Col. 4 lines 31-42 and Col. 8 lines 58-63.

101. As per claim 83, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 80. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that at least one of the components is a software component. See Col. 3 lines 36-41.

102. As per claim 84, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 80. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that at least one of the components is a firmware component. See Col. 3 lines 36-41.

103. As per claim 85, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 80. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that at least one of the components is a tamper resistant component. See Col. 5 lines 37-60.

104. As per claim 86, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 80. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that at least one of the components is a hardware component. See Col. 3 lines 36-41.

105. As per claim 87, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 83. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that at least one of the software components is updateable. See Col. 5 lines 33-37.

106. As per claim 88, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 84. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that at least one of the firmware components is updateable. See Col. 5 lines 33-37.

107. As per claim 89, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 62. Furthermore, Flavin teaches that the method comprises of using at least one updateable component. See Col. 5 lines 33-37.

108. Claims 42-58, 90-107, and 135-151 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeung et al. (US Patent Number 6,668,246) in view of Flavin et al. (US Patent Number 6,219,788) and in further view of Symantec (User Manual and Notification Page).

109. As per claim 42, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 41. The method of Yeung and Flavin fails to disclose the updateable component being associated with a revision level identifier. Symantec, however, teaches a method for updating software using LiveUpdate (See User Manual pages 37-40) or Intelligent Updater that is associated with a revision level identifier (Sequence Number). See Intelligent Updater Notification Page. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

110. As per claim 43, Yeung and Flavin and Symantec are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 42. Furthermore, Symantec discloses the revision level identifier is a version number (Defs Version). See Intelligent Updater Notification Page. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

111. As per claim 44, Yeung and Flavin and Symantec are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 42. Furthermore, Symantec discloses the revision level identifier is a revision date (Extended Version). See Intelligent Updater Notification Page. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

112. As per claim 45, Yeung and Flavin and Symantec are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 42. Furthermore, Yeung discloses an aspect of the operation of the underlying system (rendering) depending on the revision level. See Col. 8 lines 1-20. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

113. As per claim 46, Yeung and Flavin and Symantec are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 45. Furthermore, Yeung discloses at least come functionality of the underlying system (rendering) is limited if the revision level does not belong to a specific set of revision levels. See Col. 8 lines 1-20. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

114. As per claim 47, Yeung and Flavin and Symantec are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 46. Furthermore, Yeung discloses the limited functionality comprises of the ability to receive a set of digital content. See Col. 8 lines 1-20. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

115. As per claim 48, Yeung and Flavin and Symantec are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 46. Furthermore, Yeung discloses the limited functionality comprises of the ability to receive a set of digital content in a specific format (lesser quality). See Col. 8 lines 1-20. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

116. As per claim 49, Yeung and Flavin and Symantec are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 46. Furthermore, Yeung discloses the limited functionality comprises of the ability to receive a set of digital content in a specific method. See Col. 8 lines 1-20. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

117. As per claim 50, Yeung and Flavin and Symantec are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 42. Furthermore, Symantec teaches that the revision level is communicated to at least one other component (Antivirus Software) of the underlying system by the updateable component (LiveUpdate/Intelligent Updater). See User Manual pages 37-40. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

118. As per claim 51, Yeung and Flavin and Symantec are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 50. Furthermore, Symantec teaches that the communication is initiated by the updateable component. See User Manual pages 37-40. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

119. As per claim 52, Yeung and Flavin and Symantec are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 50. Furthermore, Symantec teaches that the communication is part of another communication that is part of the normal workflow of the underlying system. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

120. As per claim 53, Yeung and Flavin and Symantec are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 50. Furthermore, Symantec teaches that the communication is initiated by the other component of the underlying system. See User Manual pages 37-40. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

121. As per claim 54, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 41. The method of Yeung and Flavin fails to disclose that a component within the

untrusted environment queries another component in the underlying system for a revisioned version of the updateable component. Symantec is directed to a method for updating software using LiveUpdate (See User Manual pages 37-40) or Intelligent Updater. Symantec teaches a component within the untrusted environment queries another component in the underlying system for a revisioned version of the updateable component. See User Manual pages 37-40. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

122. As per claim 55, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 41. The method of Yeung and Flavin fails to disclose that a component within the untrusted environment queries another component in the underlying system for a revisioned version of the updateable component. Symantec is directed to a method for updating software using LiveUpdate (See User Manual pages 37-40) or Intelligent Updater. Symantec teaches the transfer of updateable component (download) is performed automatically without intervention. See User Manual page 38-39. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for

protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

123. As per claim 56, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 41. The method of Yeung and Flavin fails to disclose that a component within the untrusted environment queries another component in the underlying system for a revisioned version of the updateable component. Symantec is directed to a method for updating software using LiveUpdate (See User Manual pages 37-40) or Intelligent Updater. Symantec teaches the transfer of the updateable component (download) is initiated by approval. See User Manual pages 37-38. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

124. As per claim 57, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 41. The method of Yeung and Flavin fails to disclose that a component within the

untrusted environment queries another component in the underlying system for a revisioned version of the updateable component. Symantec is directed to a method for updating software using LiveUpdate (See User Manual pages 37-40) or Intelligent Updater. Symantec teaches the installation of the updateable component is performed automatically without intervention. See User Manual page 38-39. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

125. As per claim 58, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 41. The method of Yeung and Flavin fails to disclose that a component within the untrusted environment queries another component in the underlying system for a revisioned version of the updateable component. Symantec is directed to a method for updating software using LiveUpdate (See User Manual pages 37-40) or Intelligent Updater. Symantec teaches the installation of the updateable component is initiated by approval. See User Manual pages 37-38. The method of Yeung and Flavin as well as the method of Symantec are analogous art because they are directed toward the updating of software needed for protection of digital content. At the time of the

invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of updating of Flavin and Yeung to include the Intelligent Updater and LiveUpdate as described by Symantec. The motivation for doing so would be to make the process of updating quicker and easier.

126. As per claims 90-106 and 135-151, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claims 89 and 134, respectively. See arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 42-58. Claims 90-107 and 135-151 are rejected based on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 42-58.

127. As per claim 107, Yeung and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claims 89. See arguments with respect to the rejection of claim 90. Claim 107 is rejected based on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 90.

128. Claims 162, 166-170 and 174-177 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flavin et al. (US Patent Number 6,219,788) as applied to claim 108 above, and further in view of Yeung et al. (US Patent Number 6,668,246).

129. As per claim 162, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 108. Flavin teaches digital content arriving into the trusted environment (watchdog). See Col. 3 lines 36-41. Flavin fails to disclose that it arrives in a cryptographically encrypted form. Yeung, however, teaches digital content (content 290) arriving in a cryptographically

encrypted form. See Col. 6 lines 32-36 and Figure 2. Flavin and Yeung are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Flavin to include cryptographic encryption of Yeung. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content from being observed by an unauthorized user or manipulated by a malicious program (Col. 1 lines 36-40).

130. As per claim 166, Flavin is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 108. Flavin fails to disclose the environment comprising a mechanism to restrict copying of at least one of the outputs the environment generates. Yeung teaches a mechanism (watermark extraction mechanism) for restricting copying of at least one output. See Col. 8 line 58 - Col. 9 line 4 and Fig. 8. Flavin and Yeung are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Flavin to include the copy protection of Yeung. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content from being observed by an unauthorized user (Col. 1 lines 36-40).

131. As per claim 167, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 166. Flavin fails to disclose the output being part of an internal interface. Yeung, however, teaches the output being part on an internal interface. See Col. 8 line 58 -

Col. 9 line 4 and Fig. 8. Flavin and Yeung are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Flavin to include the copy protection of Yeung. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content from being observed by an unauthorized user (Col. 1 lines 36-40).

132. As per claim 168, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 166. Flavin fails to disclose the output being an external output. Yeung, however, teaches the output being an external output (content player). See Col. 8 line 58 - Col. 9 line 4 and Fig. 9. Flavin and Yeung are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Flavin to include the copy protection of Yeung. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content from being observed by an unauthorized user (Col. 1 lines 36-40).

133. As per claim 169, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 168. Flavin fails to disclose the external output is sound output. Yeung, however, teaches the external output (content player) is sound output. See Col. 2 line 60 - Col. 3 line 5. Flavin and Yeung are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Flavin to include the copy protection of Yeung. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content from being observed by an unauthorized user (Col. 1 lines 36-40).

134. As per claim 170, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 168. Flavin fails to disclose the external output is video output. Yeung, however, teaches the external output (content player) is video output. See Col. 2 line 60 - Col. 3 line 5. Flavin and Yeung are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Flavin to include the copy protection of Yeung. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content from being observed by an unauthorized user (Col. 1 lines 36-40).

135. As per claim 174, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in rejection of claim 166. Flavin fails to disclose that the mechanism to restrict copying is comprised of altering the output in order to change the quality of the copy. Yeung, however, teaches that the mechanism to restrict copying comprises of altering the output in order to change the quality of the copy which is produced by the copying. See Col. 8 line 1-20. Flavin and Yeung are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have

been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Flavin to include the copy protection of Yeung. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content from being observed by an unauthorized user (Col. 1 lines 36-40).

136. As per claim 175, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in rejection of claim 174. Flavin fails to disclose that the quality of the copy is the observable quality of the copy. Yeung, however, teaches that the quality of the copy is the observable quality of the copy. See Col. 8 line 1-20 and Fig. 6. Flavin and Yeung are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Flavin to include the copy protection of Yeung. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content from being observed by an unauthorized user (Col. 1 lines 36-40).

137. As per claim 176, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in rejection of claim 174. Flavin fails to disclose that the change of the quality is to adversely affect the quality. Yeung, however, teaches that the change of the quality is to adversely affect the quality. See Col. 8 line 1-20 and Fig. 6. Flavin and Yeung are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Flavin to include the copy protection of Yeung.

The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content from being observed by an unauthorized user (Col. 1 lines 36-40).

138. As per claim 177, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 174. Flavin fails to disclose the copying is digital copying. Yeung, however, teaches the copying is digital copying. See Col. 8 line 58 - Col. 9 line 4 and Fig. 8. Flavin and Yeung are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Flavin to include the copy protection of Yeung. The motivation for doing so would be to further protect the digital content from being observed by an unauthorized user (Col. 1 lines 36-40).

139. Claims 171-173 and 178-179 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flavin et al. (US Patent Number 6,219,788) in view of Yeung et al. (US Patent Number 6,668,246) and further in view of Wang (US Patent Number 6,885,748).

140. As per claim 171, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 168. The method of Flavin and Yeung do not disclose the external output is analog output. Wang, however, teaches the external output (content player) is analog output. See Col. 35 lines 4-15. Flavin, Yeung and Wang are analogous art because they all both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of

the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of copy protection of Flavin and Yeung to include the digital to analog converter as described by Wang. The motivation for doing so would be to make more formats available to increase compatibility with other systems.

141. As per claim 172, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 171. The method of Flavin and Yeung do not disclose the analog output is analog sound output. Wang, however, teaches the analog output is analog sound output. See Col. 35 lines 4-15. Flavin, Yeung and Wang are analogous art because they all both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of copy protection of Flavin and Yeung to include the digital to analog converter as described by Wang. The motivation for doing so would be to make more formats available to increase compatibility with other systems.

142. As per claim 173, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 171. The method of Flavin and Yeung do not disclose the analog output is analog video output. Wang, however, teaches the analog output is analog video output. See Col. 35 lines 4-15. Flavin, Yeung and Wang are analogous art because they all both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of copy protection of Flavin and Yeung to include the digital to analog converter as

described by Wang. The motivation for doing so would be to make more formats available to increase compatibility with other systems.

143. As per claim 178, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 174. The method of Flavin and Yeung do not disclose the copying is non-digital copying. Wang, however, teaches the copying is non-digital copying. See Col. 35 lines 4-15. Flavin, Yeung and Wang are analogous art because they all both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of copy protection of Flavin and Yeung to include the digital to analog converter as described by Wang. The motivation for doing so would be to make more formats available to increase compatibility with other systems.

144. As per claim 179, Flavin and Yeung are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 174. The method of Flavin and Yeung do not disclose the digital copying involves non-digital transition. Wang, however, teaches the digital copying involves non-digital transition. See Col. 35 lines 4-15. Flavin, Yeung and Wang are analogous art because they all both directed to methods for protecting the distribution of digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of copy protection of Flavin and Yeung to include the digital to analog converter as described by Wang. The motivation for doing so would be to make more formats available to increase compatibility with other systems.

Conclusion

145. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael A. Cervone whose telephone number is 571-272-3712. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MAC 4/27/06

CHRISTOPHER REVAK
PRIMARY EXAMINER
5/1/06